IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Henry G. Johnson et al

Serial No.: 10/804,342

Filed: March 19, 2004

Title: Turbocompressor Impelling Fuel Recycle in Fuel Cell Power Plant

Docket No.: C-2960

Art Unit: 1745

Examiner: Dove, Tracy Mae

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated October 24, 2007. Claims 7-10 having been allowed, claims 1-4 remain for consideration.

Claims 1-4 are rejected as obvious over Keefer. The undersigned has not properly presented the case for claims 1-4 as being patentable over Keefer. Specifically, claim 1 calls for "a source of hydrogen-rich fuel gas, said hydrogen-rich fuel gas being applied to said fuel reactant flow fields." And it calls for "a turbine of which is driven by said source of hydrogen-rich fuel gas". Therefore, the same gas that is applied to the anode has to be applied to the turbine. In Keefer, the gas effluent from the anode is applied to the turbine, not the gas entering the anode. The issue is simple: the same gas has to be applied to the anode as is applied to the turbine. Keefer does not disclose that or even hint at it in any fashion whatsoever. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 over Keefer is respectfully requested.

The allowance of claims 7-10 is noted with extreme gratitude. Concerning the reasons for allowance, the Examiner stated that "The prior art does not teach or suggest the impeller of claim 1 comprising a compressor of a turbocompressor, a turbine of which is driven by the same hydrogen-rich fuel gas which is applied the fuel reactant flow fields." Claims 1-4 have the same allowable feature.

The "Response to Amendment" admits that the turbine in Keefer is driven by anode exhaust: we all agree on that. The claim calls for the turbine to be driven by the